

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 1-8. These sheets replace the original sheets.

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **05 January 2010**, the Examiner reviewed claims 38-47. Examiner objected to the drawings as being difficult to read. Examiner rejected claims 38-41, 46, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Rabin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,948, hereinafter “Rabin”), and Krishnan (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,124, hereinafter “Krishnan”). Examiner rejected claims 42-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Rabin and Krishnan as applied to claim 38, and further in view of another embodiment of Rabin.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiner for the phone interview conducted on 24 February 2010. Applicant proposed amendments to the claims and argued that the cited references Rabin and Krishnan do not disclose that a license for a single feature is required to access a respective feature among multiple features. Examiner stated that the proposed amendment overcomes the cited references and that an updated search will be performed. Accordingly, Applicant has incorporated the proposed amendments into this response.

Objections to the Drawings

Applicant has submitted replacement sheets for all the drawings. Applicant respectfully submits that the drawings attached to this response overcome Examiner’s rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Examiner rejected claims 38-41, 46, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Rabin and Krishnan. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, because neither Rabin nor Krishnan discloses executing a software

program comprising a plurality of features, wherein a **license for a single feature** is required to access a respective feature among the features.

First, Rabin discloses a monitoring system that sends a continuation message to a user device to either disable or continue to enable previously installed software on the user device. Specifically, the Rabin system disables or continues to enable use of the software by updating tags that already exist on the user device (Rabin, abstract, and column 5, lines 8-28, column 48, line 47 to column 49, line 2, and column 50, lines 33-65). Thus, the continuation message in Rabin does not license a single feature that has not been previously installed on the user device. Second, Krishnan discloses requesting to try or buy an item of merchandise, and subsequently downloading client components associated with the requested item. One of the client components is a “secured” content component (Krishna, column 5, lines 6-27). However, the “secured” component is merely an encrypted copy of content and various components needed to license and purchase the merchandise and to decrypt the content (Krishna, column 7, lines 24-29). Therefore, Krishnan also fails to disclose a license for a single feature is required to access a respective feature among the plurality of features.

In contrast, embodiments of the present invention involve an executing software program that includes a plurality of features, wherein a license for a single feature is required to access a respective feature among the features (instant application, pars. [0009]-[0010] and [0022]). Because the client and the server continue to exchange software license information as the user operates the software program over a period of time, the user's software license can be updated dynamically as desired (instant application, par. [0012]). Updating the user's software license dynamically not only allows for termination or restriction of the license when fraud is detected, but also allows for incremental modification of an active license, for example, when the user purchases or declines various upgrades (instant application, par. [0012]).

Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 38, 46, and 47 to clarify that embodiments of the present invention involve an executing software program that includes a plurality of features, wherein **a license for a single feature** is required to access a respective feature among the features. These amendments find support in instant application, pars. [0009]-[0010], [0012], and [0022]. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 38, 46, and 47, are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 39-45, which depend upon claim 38, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Ying Wang/
Ying Wang
Registration No. 63,786

/Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 05 April 2010

Ying Wang
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 204-4051
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: annie@parklegal.com

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com